

1 SO. CAL. EQUAL ACCESS GROUP
Jason J. Kim (SBN 190246)
2 Jason Yoon (SBN 306137)
101 S. Western Ave., Second Floor
Los Angeles, CA 90004
3 Telephone: (213) 252-8008
Facsimile: (213) 252-8009
4 scalequalaccess@yahoo.com

5 Attorneys for Plaintiff
KORTTNEY ELLIOTT
6

7 **UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT**
8 **CENTRAL DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA**
9

10 KORTTNEY ELLIOTT,

11 Plaintiff,

12 vs.

13
14 9800 RUSH, LLC; and DOES 1 through
15 10,

16 Defendants.
17
18
19
20
21
22
23

Case No.:

COMPLAINT FOR INJUNCTIVE
RELIEF AND DAMAGES FOR
VIOLATION OF:

1. AMERICANS WITH DISABILITIES
ACT, 42 U.S.C. §12131 et seq.;
2. CALIFORNIA'S UNRUH CIVIL
RIGHTS ACT, CAL CIV. CODE §§ 51 -
52 et seq.;
3. CALIFORNIA'S DISABLED
PERSONS ACT, CAL CIV. CODE §54 et
seq.
4. CALIFORNIA HEALTH & SAFETY
CODE § 19955, et seq.
5. NEGLIGENCE

24 Plaintiff KORTTNEY ELLIOTT ("Plaintiff") complains of Defendants 9800
25 RUSH, LLC; and DOES 1 through 10 ("Defendants") and alleges as follows:
26
27
28

//

//

PARTIES

1
2 1. Plaintiff is a California resident with a physical disability. Plaintiff suffers
3 from hemiplegia, is substantially limited in her ability to walk and requires the use of a
4 wheelchair at all times when traveling in public.

5 2. Defendants are, or were at the time of the incident, the real property owners,
6 business operators, lessors and/or lessees of the real property for a hair salon ("Business")
7 located at or about 9810 Rush St., South El Monte, California.

8 3. The true names and capacities, whether individual, corporate, associate or
9 otherwise of Defendant DOES 1 to 10, and each of them, are unknown to Plaintiff, who
10 therefore sues said Defendants by such fictitious names. Plaintiff will ask leave of Court
11 to amend this Complaint when the true names and capacities have been ascertained.
12 Plaintiff is informed and believes and, based thereon, alleges that each such fictitiously
13 named Defendants are responsible in some manner, and therefore, liable to Plaintiff for
14 the acts herein alleged.

15 4. Plaintiff is informed and believes, and thereon alleges that, at all relevant
16 times, each of the Defendants was the agent, employee, or alter-ego of each of the other
17 Defendants, and/or was acting in concert with each of the other Defendants, and in doing
18 the things alleged herein was acting with the knowledge and consent of the other
19 Defendants and within the course and scope of such agency or employment relationship.

20 5. Whenever and wherever reference is made in this Complaint to any act or
21 failure to act by a defendant or Defendants, such allegations and references shall also be
22 deemed to mean the acts and failures to act of each Defendant acting individually, jointly
23 and severally.

24 **JURISDICTION AND VENUE**

25 6. The Court has jurisdiction of this action pursuant to 28 USC §§ 1331 and
26 1343 for violation of the Americans with Disabilities Act of 1990, (42 USC §12101, *et*
27 *seq.*)
28

7. Pursuant to pendant jurisdiction, attendant and related causes of action, arising from the same nucleus of operating facts, are also brought under California law, including, but not limited to, violations of California Civil Code §§51, 51.5, 52(a), 52.1, 54, 54., 54.3 and 55.

8. Plaintiff's claims are authorized by 28 USC §§ 2201 and 2202.

9. Venue is proper in this court pursuant to 28 USC §1391(b). The real property which is subject of this action is located in this district, Los Angeles County, California, and Plaintiff's causes of actions arose in this district.

FACTUAL ALLEGATIONS

10. In or about April of 2022, Plaintiff went to the Business.

11. The Business is a hair salon business establishment, open to the public, and is a place of public accommodation and affects commerce through its operation. Defendants provide parking spaces for customers.

12. While attempting to enter the Business during each visit, Plaintiff personally encountered a number of barriers that interfered with her ability to use and enjoy the goods, services, privileges, and accommodations offered at the Business.

13. To the extent of Plaintiff's personal knowledge, the barriers at the Business included, but were not limited to, the following:

a. Defendant failed to maintain the parking space designated for persons with disabilities to comply with the federal and state standards.

Defendants failed to maintain the paint on the ground as required.

- b. Defendants failed to maintain the parking space designated for persons with disabilities to comply with the federal and state standards. Defendants failed to post required signage stating “Minimum Fine \$250.” “Van Accessible” and “Unauthorized Parking.”

c. Defendants failed to maintain the parking space designated for persons with disabilities to comply with the federal and state

standards. Defendants failed to maintain the mark on the space with the International Symbol of Accessibility.

14. These barriers and conditions denied Plaintiff the full and equal access to the Business and caused her difficulty and frustration. Plaintiff wishes to return and patronize the Business, however, Plaintiff is deterred from visiting the Business because her knowledge of these violations prevents her from returning until the barriers are removed.

15. Based on the violations, Plaintiff alleges, on information and belief, that there are additional barriers to accessibility at the Business after further site inspection. Plaintiff seeks to have all barriers related to her disability remedied. *See Doran v. 7-Eleven, Inc.* 524 F.3d 1034 (9th Cir. 2008).

16. In addition, Plaintiff alleges, on information and belief, that Defendants knew that particular barriers render the Business inaccessible, violate state and federal law, and interfere with access for the physically disabled.

17. At all relevant times, Defendants had and still have control and dominion over the conditions at this location and had and still have the financial resources to remove these barriers without much difficulty or expenses to make the Business accessible to the physically disabled in compliance with ADDAG and Title 24 regulations. Defendants have not removed such barriers and have not modified the Business to conform to accessibility regulations.

FIRST CAUSE OF ACTION

VIOLATION OF THE AMERICANS WITH DISABILITIES ACT OF 1990

18. Plaintiff incorporates by reference each of the allegations in all prior paragraphs in this complaint.

19. Under the Americans with Disabilities Act of 1990 (“ADA”), no individual shall be discriminated against on the basis of disability in the full and equal enjoyment of the goods, services, facilities, privileges, advantages, or accommodations of any place of

1 public accommodation by any person who owns, leases, or leases to, or operates a place
2 of public accommodation. *See* 42 U.S.C. § 12182(a).

3 20. Discrimination, *inter alia*, includes:

- 4 a. A failure to make reasonable modification in policies, practices, or
5 procedures, when such modifications are necessary to afford such
6 goods, services, facilities, privileges, advantages, or accommodations
7 to individuals with disabilities, unless the entity can demonstrate that
8 making such modifications would fundamentally alter the nature of
9 such goods, services, facilities, privileges, advantages, or
10 accommodations. 42 U.S.C. § 12182(b)(2)(A)(ii).
- 11 b. A failure to take such steps as may be necessary to ensure that no
12 individual with a disability is excluded, denied services, segregated or
13 otherwise treated differently than other individuals because of the
14 absence of auxiliary aids and services, unless the entity can
15 demonstrate that taking such steps would fundamentally alter the
16 nature of the good, service, facility, privilege, advantage, or
17 accommodation being offered or would result in an undue burden. 42
18 U.S.C. § 12182(b)(2)(A)(iii).
- 19 c. A failure to remove architectural barriers, and communication barriers
20 that are structural in nature, in existing facilities, and transportation
21 barriers in existing vehicles and rail passenger cars used by an
22 establishment for transporting individuals (not including barriers that
23 can only be removed through the retrofitting of vehicles or rail
24 passenger cars by the installation of a hydraulic or other lift), where
25 such removal is readily achievable. 42 U.S.C. § 12182(b)(2)(A)(iv).
- 26 d. A failure to make alterations in such a manner that, to the maximum
27 extent feasible, the altered portions of the facility are readily
28 accessible to and usable by individuals with disabilities, including

1 individuals who use wheelchairs or to ensure that, to the maximum
2 extent feasible, the path of travel to the altered area and the
3 bathrooms, telephones, and drinking fountains serving the altered
4 area, are readily accessible to and usable by individuals with
5 disabilities where such alterations to the path or travel or the
6 bathrooms, telephones, and drinking fountains serving the altered
7 area are not disproportionate to the overall alterations in terms of cost
8 and scope. 42 U.S.C. § 12183(a)(2).

9 21. Where parking spaces are provided, accessible parking spaces shall be
10 provided. 1991 ADA Standards § 4.1.2(5); 2010 ADA Standards § 208. One in every
11 eight accessible spaces, but not less than one, shall be served by an access aisle 96 in
12 (2440 mm) wide minimum and shall be designated “van accessible.” 1991 ADA
13 Standards § 4.1.2(5)(b). For every six or fraction of six parking spaces, at least one shall
14 be van parking space. 2010 ADA Standards § 208.2.4.

15 22. For the parking spaces, access aisles shall be marked with a blue painted
16 borderline around their perimeter. The area within the blue borderlines shall be marked
17 with hatched lines a maximum of 36 inches (914 mm) on center in a color contrasting
18 with that of the aisle surface, preferably blue or white. The words "NO PARKING" shall
19 be painted on the surface within each access aisle in white letters a minimum of 12 inches
20 (305 mm) in height and located to be visible from the adjacent vehicular way. CBC §
21 11B-502.3.3.

22 23. Here, Defendants failed to properly maintain the access aisles as there were
23 faded “NO PARKING” and faded blue lines painted on the parking surface.

24 24. Under the ADA, the method and color of marking are to be addressed by
25 State or local laws or regulations. *See* 36 C.F.R., Part 1191. Under the California
26 Building Code (“CBC”), the parking space identification signs shall include the
27 International Symbol of Accessibility. Parking identification signs shall be reflectorized
28 with a minimum area of 70 square inches. Additional language or an additional sign

1 below the International Symbol of Accessibility shall state “Minimum Fine \$250.” A
2 parking space identification sign shall be permanently posted immediately adjacent and
3 visible from each parking space, shall be located with its centerline a maximum of 12
4 inches from the centerline of the parking space and may be posted on a wall at the
5 interior end of the parking space. *See* CBC § 11B-502.6, *et seq.*

6 25. Moreover, an additional sign shall be posted either in a conspicuous place at
7 each entrance to an off-street parking facility or immediately adjacent to on-site
8 accessible parking and visible from each parking space. The additional sign shall not be
9 less than 17 inches wide by 22 inches high. The additional sign shall clearly state in
10 letters with a minimum height of 1 inch the following: “Unauthorized vehicles parked in
11 designated accessible spaces not displaying distinguishing placards or special license
12 plates issued for persons with disabilities will be towed always at the owner’s expense...”
13 *See* CBC § 11B-502.8, *et seq.*

14 26. Here, Defendants failed to provide the parking space identification sign with
15 the International Symbol of Accessibility. Defendants failed to provide a sign stating
16 “Minimum Fine \$250” and “Van Accessible.” Moreover, Defendants failed to provide
17 the additional sign with the specific languages stating “Unauthorized vehicles parked in
18 designated accessible spaces not displaying distinguishing placards or special license
19 plates issued for persons with disabilities will be towed always at the owner’s expense...”

20 27. A public accommodation shall maintain in operable working condition those
21 features of facilities and equipment that are required to be readily accessible to and usable
22 by persons with disabilities by the Act or this part. 28 C.F.R. 35.211(a).

23 28. By failing to maintain the facility to be readily accessible and usable by
24 Plaintiff, Defendants are in violation of Plaintiff’s rights under the ADA and its related
25 regulations.

26 29. The Business has denied and continues to deny full and equal access to
27 Plaintiff and to other people with disabilities. Plaintiff has been and will continue to be
28 discriminated against due to the lack of accessible facilities, and therefore, seeks

1 injunctive relief to alter facilities to make such facilities readily accessible to and usable
2 by individuals with disabilities.

3 **SECOND CAUSE OF ACTION**

4 **VIOLATION OF THE UNRUH CIVIL RIGHTS ACT**

5 30. Plaintiff incorporates by reference each of the allegations in all prior
6 paragraphs in this complaint.

7 31. California Civil Code § 51 states, “All persons within the jurisdiction of this
8 state are free and equal, and no matter what their sex, race, color, religion, ancestry,
9 national origin, disability, medical condition, genetic information, marital status, sexual
10 orientation, citizenship, primary language, or immigration status are entitled to the full
11 and equal accommodations, advantages, facilities, privileges, or services in all business
12 establishments of every kind whatsoever.”

13 32. California Civil Code § 52 states, “Whoever denies, aids or incites a denial,
14 or make any discrimination or distinction contrary to Section 51, 51.5, or 51.6, is liable
15 for each and every offense for the actual damages, and any amount that may be
16 determined by a jury, or a court sitting without a jury, up to a maximum of three times the
17 amount of actual damage but in no case less than four thousand dollars (\$4,000) and any
18 attorney’s fees that may be determined by the court in addition thereto, suffered by any
19 person denied the rights provided in Section 51, 51.5, or 51.6.

20 33. California Civil Code § 51(f) specifies, “a violation of the right of any
21 individual under federal Americans with Disabilities Act of 1990 (Public Law 101-336)
22 shall also constitute a violation of this section.”

23 34. The actions and omissions of Defendants alleged herein constitute a denial
24 of full and equal accommodation, advantages, facilities, privileges, or services by
25 physically disabled persons within the meaning of California Civil Code §§ 51 and 52.
26 Defendants have discriminated against Plaintiff in violation of California Civil Code §§
27 51 and 52.
28

1 constitute a violation of this section, and nothing in this section shall be construed to limit
2 the access of any person in violation of that act.

3 40. The actions and omissions of Defendants alleged herein constitute a denial
4 of full and equal accommodation, advantages, and facilities by physically disabled
5 persons within the meaning of California Civil Code § 54. Defendants have
6 discriminated against Plaintiff in violation of California Civil Code § 54.

7 41. The violations of the California Disabled Persons Act caused Plaintiff to
8 experience difficulty, discomfort, and embarrassment. The Defendants are also liable for
9 statutory damages as specified in California Civil Code §55.56(a)-(c).

10 **FOURTH CAUSE OF ACTION**

11 **CALIFORNIA HEALTH & SAFETY CODE § 19955, et seq.**

12 42. Plaintiff incorporates by reference each of the allegations in all prior
13 paragraphs in this complaint.

14 43. Plaintiff and other similar physically disabled persons who require the use of
15 a wheelchair are unable to use public facilities on a “full and equal” basis unless each
16 such facility is in compliance with the provisions of California Health & Safety Code §
17 19955 et seq. Plaintiff is a member of the public whose rights are protected by the
18 provisions of California Health & Safety Code § 19955 et seq.

19 44. The purpose of California Health & Safety Code § 1995 et seq. is to ensure
20 that public accommodations or facilities constructed in this state with private funds
21 adhere to the provisions of Chapter 7 (commencing with Section 4450) of Division 5 of
22 Title 1 of the Government Code. The code relating to such public accommodations also
23 require that “when sanitary facilities are made available for the public, clients, or
24 employees in these stations, centers, or buildings, they shall be made available for
25 persons with disabilities.

26 45. Title II of the ADA holds as a “general rule” that no individual shall be
27 discriminated against on the basis of disability in the full and equal enjoyment of goods
28 (or use), services, facilities, privileges, and accommodations offered by any person who

owns, operates, or leases a place of public accommodation. 42 U.S.C. § 12182(a). Further, each and every violation of the ADA also constitutes a separate and distinct violation of California Civil Code §§ 54(c) and 54.1(d), thus independently justifying an award of damages and injunctive relief pursuant to California law, including but not limited to Civil Code § 54.3 and Business and Professions Code § 17200, et seq.

FIFTH CAUSE OF ACTION

NEGLIGENCE

46. Plaintiff incorporates by reference each of the allegations in all prior paragraphs in this complaint.

47. Defendants have a general duty and a duty under the ADA, Unruh Civil Rights Act and California Disabled Persons Act to provide safe and accessible facilities to the Plaintiff.

48. Defendants breached their duty of care by violating the provisions of ADA, Unruh Civil Rights Act and California Disabled Persons Act.

49. As a direct and proximate result of Defendants' negligent conduct, Plaintiff has suffered damages.

PRAYER FOR RELIEF

WHEREFORE, Plaintiff respectfully prays for relief and judgment against Defendants as follows:

1. For preliminary and permanent injunction directing Defendants to comply with the Americans with Disability Act and the Unruh Civil Rights Act;

2. Award of all appropriate damages, including but not limited to statutory damages, general damages and treble damages in amounts, according to proof;

3. Award of all reasonable restitution for Defendants' unfair competition practices;

4. Reasonable attorney's fees, litigation expenses, and costs of suit in this action;

5. Prejudgment interest pursuant to California Civil Code § 3291; and

1 6. Such other and further relief as the Court deems just and proper.

2 **DEMAND FOR TRIAL BY JURY**

3 Pursuant to Rule 38(b) of the Federal Rules of Civil Procedure, Plaintiff hereby
4 demands a trial by jury on all issues so triable.

5
6 Dated: June 17, 2022

SO. CAL. EQUAL ACCESS GROUP

7
8
9 By: /s/ Jason J. Kim
10 Jason J. Kim, Esq.
11 Attorneys for Plaintiff
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28